

From: Pierce, Jeff
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 2:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the court:

I strongly agree that the Government should accept the proposed settlement terms and get the Microsoft case resolved without further litigation.

The lawsuit is clearly Microsoft's competitors' attempt to injure, harm, distract, and frivolously litigate a successful, tough American company. Please remember the following facts as you consider settlement:

- 1) The initial lawsuits were filed after lobbying by Microsoft competitors - not by citizen groups. Read Lawyer Reeback's history.
- 2) Microsoft is a monopoly in their own product and can modify it as they like. They can expand and add functionality to their products just like their vociferous competitors do - Oracle and SUN being two of the primary agitators.
- 3) There is plenty of choice for all technologies. Within the information industry, I count just four competitor's revenues (IBM/SUN/ORACLE/APPLE) at well over \$100 Billion dollars in just these four named companies. They should develop and market technologies that compete on their merits. I don't see Microsoft getting the state of Washington to sue IBM for their monopoly on IBM mainframes - AND PREDATORY MAINFRAME SOFTWARE PRICING PRACTICES THAT ARE WELL DOCUMENTED IN THE INDUSTRY. Why not? People look at "disruptive technology choices" that accomplish business goals by choosing from a myriad of other products that accomplish their goals..

NO CONSUMER HARM

The biggest legal issue was supposed to be consumer harm. In all the documents I read on this court case, I have yet to see quantified or estimated damages to consumers. In fact, maybe consumers should PAY MICROSOFT for adding valuable features at no charge into their products - features they could otherwise pay for to "competitors".

The average selling price of PC hardware combined with Microsoft software has fallen probably 66% since I have professionally sold computers and networks for a living. Again, a CONSUMER BENEFIT due to Microsoft.

Final Note: I understand some company called Apple Computer makes an electronic box without Microsoft software; such box is able to mimic functionality provided by Microsoft powered hardware. Consumers can order this box today, immediately, on the Internet and never have to buy Microsoft. Easy to choose alternatives, isn't it?

STATES GOVERNMENTS ARE LACKEYS AND CO-CONSPIRATORS

I am extremely disturbed by states suing on behalf of business competitors. As pointed out, there is no consumer harm - just business competition through the natural competitiveness of the technology industry. The states that choose not to settle should have some fairly well defined precedents set by the current agreement proposal between the Govt/Settling States and Microsoft. Precedents that will stop their continued foolishness in this lawsuit.

Regards,
Jeff Pierce
16 Jesse Dr
Mercerville, NJ 08619
609-584-8621
jeff@pierce.net

CC: 'jeff(a)pierce.net'